

III. REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1 and 6 have been amended. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1, 2, 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Chou *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,035,289), hereafter "Chou." Claims 3-5 and 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Chou.

A. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-5 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §101

The Office has rejected claims 1-5 for allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite, "a computer implemented method for matching commodity suppliers with intending purchasers." Applicants assert that this amendment further directs the invention to statutory subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

B. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 2, 6 AND 7 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

With regard to the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection over Chou, Applicants assert that Chou does not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention. Specifically, with respect to independent claims 1 and 6, Applicants submit that Chou fails to teach or suggest comparing only the desired purchase price and the desired purchase quantity of said purchase wish list with the supply price and supply quantity of said supply list. The invention in Chou matches shippers with companies having goods to be shipped. Col. 2, lines 28-35. In order to accomplish its goal, Chou has both the shipper and carrier specify attributes, including: origin-destination pair, departure time window and arrival time window. Col. 5, line 51 through col. 6, line 6. Chou compares the departure time window and arrival time window for a particular origin-destination pair for the shipper and carrier to determine if a transaction between the two would be time window feasible. Col. 10, lines 59-61. Failure to perform this comparison would cause the Chou invention not to function correctly. In contrast, the present invention includes "...comparing only the desired purchase price and the desired purchase quantity of said purchase wish list with the supply price and supply quantity of said supply list." Claim 1. As such, the information obtained from the at least one commodity supplier or the information received from intending purchasers does not include any of the information components that would be essential in Chou. Thus, the information obtained from the at least one commodity supplier and the information received from intending purchasers as claimed in the current invention are not equivalent to the bid attributes and ask attributes of Chou. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw its rejection.

With respect to dependent claims, Applicants herein incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims from which the dependent claims depend. Furthermore, Applicants submit that all dependant claims are allowable based on their own distinct features. Since the cited art does not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

C. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 3-5 AND 8-10 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)


With regard to the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection over Chou, Applicants submit that the features of the cited art fail to teach each and every feature of the claimed invention. Specifically, as argued above, Chou fails to teach or suggest comparing only the desired purchase price and the desired purchase quantity of said purchase wish list with the supply price and supply quantity of said supply list. Furthermore, with regard to the Office's other arguments regarding dependent claims, Applicants herein incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to independent claims listed above. In addition, Applicants submit that all dependant claims are allowable based on their own distinct features. However, for brevity, Applicants will forego addressing each of these rejections individually, but reserve the right to do so should it become necessary. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw its rejection.

IV. CONCLUSION

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 29, 2004



Ronald A. D'Alessandro
Reg. No.: 42,456

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
Three E-Comm Square
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)